

INTERNALIZATION OF AIR FORCE CORE VALUES AMONG
COMPANY GRADE OFFICERS: WHERE ARE WE AND
WHERE ARE WE GOING?

A Research Paper

Presented To

The Research Department

Air Command and Staff College

In Partial Fulfillment of the Graduation Requirements of ACSC

by

Major Brian D. Anderson

March 1997

Report Documentation Page		
Report Date 00031997	Report Type N/A	Dates Covered (from... to) -
Title and Subtitle Internalization of Air Force core Values Among Company Grade Officers: Where are We and Where are We Going?	Contract Number	
	Grant Number	
	Program Element Number	
Author(s) Anderson, Brian D.	Project Number	
	Task Number	
	Work Unit Number	
Performing Organization Name(s) and Address(es) Air Command and Staff College Maxwell AFB, Al 36112	Performing Organization Report Number	
Sponsoring/Monitoring Agency Name(s) and Address(es)	Sponsor/Monitor's Acronym(s)	
	Sponsor/Monitor's Report Number(s)	
Distribution/Availability Statement Approved for public release, distribution unlimited		
Supplementary Notes		
Abstract		
Subject Terms		
Report Classification unclassified	Classification of this page unclassified	
Classification of Abstract unclassified	Limitation of Abstract UNLIMITED	
Number of Pages 56		

Disclaimer

The views expressed in this academic research paper are those of the author(s) and do not reflect the official policy or position of the US government or the Department of Defense.

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
DISCLAIMER	ii
LIST OF TABLES	iv
PREFACE	v
ABSTRACT.....	vii
CORE VALUES BACKGROUND.....	1
SOS SURVEY ON CORE VALUES OF COMPANY GRADE OFFICERS.....	7
UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE STATISTICS.....	13
ROLE OF MENTORING AND COMMANDERS	19
ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGES.....	25
CONCLUSION AND SUMMARY	30
APPENDIX A: SOS SURVEY AND RESULTS.....	34
GLOSSARY	43
BIBLIOGRAPHY	45

Tables

	<i>Page</i>
Table 1. CGO Core Values Strength	11
Table 2. CGO Courts–Martial And Article 15 Offenses	14
Table 3. CGO Specifications Tried Under Courts–Martial	15
Table 4. CGO Specifications Tried Under Article 15	16

Preface

One only need to pick up the latest issue of the Air Force Times to realize our values, as a profession of arms, are under attack. I believe the internalization of Air Force core values are critical to the long-term health of our professional officer corps. As officers, I contend it is our responsibility to those who have gone before us and to those who will come after us, to leave our proud profession even better than we found it. Therefore, I chose this topic on Air Force core values to gain a greater insight as to why we are facing these challenges and to propose some recommended solutions. In the end, each of us through our individual integrity, service, and excellence define the ultimate and lasting character of the Air Force.

This project wouldn't have been completed without a lot assistance from around Air University and the Air Force. I would like to acknowledge Dr. Richard Lester, from the Ira C. Eaker College of Professional Development, and Dr. James Toner, Professor of International Relations and Military Ethics at the Air War College for their expert advice. I appreciate the outstanding support from Capt Nicholas Lins and Capt Lista Benson from the Squadron Officers School, for allowing me to conduct a survey with company grade officers from Class 97B. A special thanks goes to MSgt Hatie Simmons, HQ USAF/JAJM for providing the statistics on Article 15's and Courts-Martials from the Automated Military Justice Analysis and Management System. In addition, I am grateful to Major Lee DeRemer at HQ USAF/LRP for his extra effort in providing countless

background information and Air Force documents on core values initiatives. A heartfelt appreciation goes to my Faculty Research Adviser Major Tony Hardin, who richly deserves a byline for his unwavering encouragement, enthusiasm, and guidance. Finally, I most definitely want to give special recognition and thanks to my beautiful bride, Elizabeth, who is and always will be a trusted confidant, best friend and love of my life.

Abstract

Our senior leadership is placing renewed emphasis on Air Force core values and recognizes the internalization of these values are critical to the long-term success of our professional officer corps. If we are going to foster these values into the 21st century then we must measure the current health of Air Force core values among our company grade officers and determine where we should focus our efforts to ensure internalization of these values. Therefore, Chapter One of this paper will focus on what makes the military unique from society, provide a brief review of the articulated core values from our senior leadership, and illustrate why our junior officer corps holds the key to sustained change. Next, Chapter Two will address the current trends concerning core values, from a company grade officer perspective, based upon a survey of SOS students. Then, Chapter Three will analyze various Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ) statistics to determine any linkages they may have to the health of company grade officer core values. Based upon my assessment of the survey and UCMJ statistics, Chapter Four will make specific recommendations concerning the role of the commander and the mentoring process to help achieve successful results. Chapter Five will address core values alignment opportunities in our organizations, systems, and processes. Finally, my conclusion will recommend a comprehensive needs assessment be instituted to determine the scope and effectiveness of the our core values program and make a call for action on the part of all officers to embrace and live the values.

Chapter 1

Core Values Background

Core values make the military what it is; without them, we cannot succeed. They are the values that instill confidence, earn lasting respect, and create willing followers. They are the values that anchor resolve in the most difficult situations. They are the values that buttress mental and physical courage when we enter combat. In essence, they are the three pillars of professionalism that provide the foundation for military leadership at every level.¹

—Secretary Sheila E. Widnall

As we prepare to check out of the BX, one only need to browse the headlines of the Air Force Times, to see our men and women in uniform coming under countless attacks for alleged improprieties concerning unprofessional conduct. These allegations create a significant impact on our ability to conduct our mission. Ultimately, our profession of arms relies on public support and trust. Therefore, our senior leadership is providing renewed emphasis on our Air Force core values of Integrity first, Service before self, and Excellence in all we do. General Fogleman states, “Our responsibility for safeguarding America is far too important and too critical to allow it to be jeopardized by those unwilling to measure up.”² In the end, each of us through our individual integrity, service, and excellence define the ultimate and lasting character of the Air Force. Hence, the internalization of Air Force core values become critical to the long-term health of our professional officer corps. If we are going to foster these values into the 21st century,

then we must rely on our company grade officers to sustain our culture and heritage. Therefore, this paper will focus on the current health of Air Force core values among our company grade officers and make specific recommendations on how we should target our efforts to achieve internalization of these values.

Numerous studies have shown values in society are changing towards individualism and self centeredness, but the military must retain its uniqueness. Our profession depends upon it. We can no longer expect society to provide us with a ready made officer candidate. This fact creates a real training and leadership challenge for our commissioning sources. According to the USAF Academy Commandant, Brigadier General Patrick Gamble, “The problem is, their [current cadets] definition of cheating and ours is different because their value system is different. You can’t say ‘don’t lie, cheat or steal,’ anymore. You’ve got to redefine for them what lying, cheating and stealing is all about.”³ However, we cannot and must not lower our standards to those of society. Instead as Richard Gabriel suggests, in order to retain our status as a profession, we should be compelled to clearly define, articulate, and protect those values which separates the military profession from society.⁴

Ultimately, character building is in everyone’s best interest. “In previous conflicts, warriors and especially prisoners of war, have frequently credited their firm foundation of beliefs and values with their emotional, mental, and even physical survival...If these solid and enduring values are not well instilled in an individual prior to entering the Service, is it not incumbent on the military leadership to try to encourage their development?”⁵ Consequently, if we, as leaders in the Air Force, allow our heritage, traditions, and values to erode toward those of society, then our Air Force “shall get and deserve the worst.”⁶

My research utilized two methods for measuring the current internalization state of core values among company grade officers. First, I conducted a survey with a random sample of 20 SOS students, to determine a word description picture of their perceptions of core values among junior officers. This allowed them to clarify in their own words the nature, status, and challenges they confront with the Air Force core values. Second, I compiled Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ) statistics on junior officers from selected Articles to determine any noticeable trends. My criteria for placing a particular UCMJ Article with a core value was purely subjective and accomplished with the sole intent of establishing a framework for further analysis. In addition, this paper makes a stated assumption that core values can be trained. Furthermore, it is important to note this study is limited to company grade officers only based upon limited time and the need to ensure an adequate focus for a more in-depth analysis. However, the need to analyze the state of internalization of core values is applicable to the entire Air Force population.

Since the Armed Forces are different from all other professions, it becomes paramount to realize that only we can bear the responsibility for developing and sustaining our cultural values which make us a profession of arms. This is a difficult obstacle to hurdle where individualism flourishes in societal values. We must retain our traditions and norms rather than accept societal norms, control our own house by fostering individuals and organizations which adhered to the values of our profession and train our people to understand and live the values we espouse.⁷ By taking the military oath of office, our officers, embark upon a profession which adheres to certain values. They have no option to accept or reject them at a later date because this is what defines our membership. “To

join an organization, an individual has to give up some aspect of his or her uniqueness, some part of their soul. Thus, there is a price in affiliating and in following.”⁸

Now that we have established our military profession as being unique, let's look at our Air Force core values as articulated by our senior leadership. Integrity first is a willingness to always do the right thing no matter what the situation. It becomes our “moral compass” or inner voice. General Fogleman, states “nothing destroys an outfit's effectiveness quicker than a lack of integrity on the part of its leadership.”⁹ Without integrity our combat capability and unit morale will suffer. As officers we must remain cognizant of our military oath of office. It is a personal commitment which obligates and makes us responsible for our own actions in administering the office we are appointed to.

Our second core value is Service before self. Our senior leadership calls on us from day one of our professional military career to subordinate our individual needs to those of the nation. As Secretary Widnall and General Fogleman express, “While personal goals often coincide with Air Force goals, there is no room for personal agendas at the expense of the institution or the American people.”¹⁰ Our military oath of office clearly calls upon us to discharge the duties of our office upon which we are entering. We must set the standard for our organizations and accomplish all the duties we are responsible for, not just the rewarding or convenient duties.

The final core value is Excellence in all we do. Secretary Widnall points out our commitment to excellence is multi-faceted and “essential in ethics, fitness, spirit, work, and relationships.”¹¹ Our military oath of office calls upon us to “Well and Faithfully Discharge” our duties. Subsequently, we have tremendous responsibilities to lead our people, ensure national survival, and efficiently use our limited resources.

According to the United States Air Force Core Values Handbook, there are four reasons why Integrity First, Service Before Self and Excellence in all we do are recognized as the core values which will take us into the 21st century. First, they are the price of admission. No one should enter the Air Force if they don't adhere to these sets of values. Second, they are "universal and unchanging" for our profession. They provide a direction or road map for our actions. Third, they help us to evaluate our individual and organizational climate from a values perspective. Fourth, they serve as a light to direct us back to professionalism and allow a transformation from a climate of erosion to a climate of commitment to our values.¹²

John Gardner reminds us "A community lives in the minds of its members—in shared assumptions, beliefs, customs, ideas that give meaning, and ideas that motivate."¹³ In addition, he contends, "values always decay over time. Societies that keep their values alive do so not by escaping the processes of decay but by powerful processes of regeneration."¹⁴ The values in our civil society are changing and our Air Force began to change with it. Our senior leadership is taking positive steps toward revitalizing our shared beliefs and core values. As officers we must follow suit and reflect on our own individual character and those of our organizations. We must begin to walk the walk. As Dr. James Toner illustrates, our proud history as an Air Force deserves, and our future depends, upon it.

"Integrity means wholeness. People in the USAF should realize that they are part of a long and venerable military tradition. In choosing courses of action, USAF people ought to remember that their actions reflect upon and, in some measure are rooted in, that tradition. All around posts and bases are reminders of the men and machines that endow the USAF with its heritage. When one acts illegally or unethically, he tramples upon the traditions of the good people who preceded him. This kind of theme, it

seems to me, can and should be emphasized in USAF core values education. We do not act alone. Those we come from (in the past) and those we influence (in the future) have a “connectedness”—an integrity—which we disregard at our personal and professional peril. All of this is in evidence in the uniform you wear and in, for example, the reveille we hear in the morning (a call to duty) and in the taps we hear in the evening—a call to remembrance.”¹⁵

Notes

¹“United States Air Force Core Values Handbook,” n.p.; on-line, Internet, 30 October 1996, available from <http://www.usafa.af.mil/core-value>.

²Gen Ronald R. Fogleman, “What the Air Force Expects of You,” *Air Force Times*, 13 May 1996, 33.

³Genevieve Anton, and Jeff Thomas, “A Question of Honor,” *Air Force Times*, 7 March 1994, 14.

⁴Richard A. Gabriel, *To Serve with Honor: A Treatise on Military Ethics and the Way of the Soldier* (Westport, CT.: Greenwood Press, 1982), 113.

⁵Lt Col Richard B. Davenport, “Leading People in Today’s Military: A Look at the Changing Values on Senior Leadership in the Armed Forces,” (Maxwell AFB, AL.: Air War College Research Report, 1994), 24.

⁶John W. Gardner, *On Leadership* (New York: The Free Press, 1990), xviii.

⁷Gabriel, 116.

⁸Thomas E. Cronin, “Thinking and Learning about Leadership,” in *AU-24 Concepts for Air Force Leadership*, ed. Dr. Richard I. Lester and Dr. A. Glenn Morton. (Maxwell AFB, AL.: Air University Press, 1996), 238.

⁹Gen Ronald R. Fogleman, “Integrity,” *Air Force Magazine*, February 1996, 91.

¹⁰Secretary Sheila E. Widnall and Gen Ronald R. Fogleman, “Core Values,” in *AU-24 Concepts for Air Force Leadership*, ed. Dr. Richard I. Lester and Dr. A. Glenn Morton. (Maxwell AFB, AL.: Air University Press, 1996), 73.

¹¹Secretary Sheila E. Widnall, “Perspectives on Leadership,” *AU-24 Concepts for Air Force Leadership*, ed. Dr. Richard I. Lester and Dr. A. Glenn Morton. (Maxwell AFB, AL.: Air University Press, 1976), 421.

¹²United States Air Force Core Values Handbook, n.p..

¹³Gardner, 13.

¹⁴*Ibid.*, 13.

¹⁵Dr. James H. Toner, Professor of International Relations and Military Ethics at the Air War College, e-mail letter addressing an author’s question on how we can turn our rich history and military traditions into a positive force for enhancing core values, 27 January 1997.

Chapter 2

SOS Survey on Core Values of Company Grade Officers

If you don't know where you are going then any road you take will get you there.

—Yogi Berra

It becomes absolutely critical, if we are to implement a program designed to enhance the core values of our company grade officers, then we must know where we currently stand. I developed a survey, which was administered to a random sampling of 20 SOS students, in order to determine a needs assessment. The survey instrument and the full results may be found at Appendix A. The questions were formatted to allow the students the freedom to make comments on the issues and to gain an insight on their perceptions of company grade officer core values.

My first objective was to determine a word description picture, from a company grade officers perspective, of behavior which characterized poor, average, and outstanding Integrity first, Service before self, and Excellence in all we do for a company grade officer. With regards to the characteristics which represented poor integrity, they overwhelming responded with word descriptions focusing on the false reporting of official documents. Such comments as “pencil whipping”, misleading, “fudging” data to fill squares, and “doctoring” mission capable reports were cited as examples. Average integrity comments focused on not taking a stand either way, doing your job in a manner to stay out of

trouble, and operating in a gray area and choosing what is best for the individual. While outstanding integrity centered on doing what is right when no one is looking, speaking the truth and doing what is right—no matter what the consequences, and taking a stand for what is right such as “calling” your commander for their inappropriate actions on the spot.

Their remarks concerning outstanding integrity mirrored the themes espoused by our senior leadership, however, their opinions on average integrity were somewhat disturbing. The word descriptions for average focused on a concept of only doing what is right when someone else is looking. Based, upon their definition of integrity we must emphasize that nothing less than outstanding integrity can be accepted or tolerated from ourselves or others.

When presented with the same question concerning Service before self, the company grade officers defined poor as having a “me” attitude, a poor work ethic, and attempting to get out of deployments, TDY’s, and bad assignments. One opinion expressed on the survey summarized the average service comments. “Most people work full, long days and frequently go TDY. This makes them average, but it demands a lot of sacrifice for most people, especially families.” Meanwhile, outstanding was characterized by a willingness to do whatever is necessary to accomplish the mission and combining the Air Force needs with your best skills and abilities. After reading the survey results, you can clearly see how torn our company grade officers are over this issue. The balancing act between the high ops tempo and TDY commitments with family concerns were evident. We are asking our young officers to do a lot and their word descriptions on sacrifices are certainly more than in line with our senior leaderships definition of service.

Finally, with regard to the same question on Excellence in all we do, they defined poor as being “good enough for government work” and simply meeting the minimum standards. Average was characterized as doing the best you can given time constraints and trying your best to meet priorities of the unit while letting other areas slide. Outstanding excellence was depicted as developing a “team attitude” and being willing to “go the extra mile” to make the organization better. The interesting aspect of this question was in what wasn’t mentioned. Only three comments were made on striving to do your best in other areas of life outside of the immediate Air Force work environment. Our senior leadership definition of excellence focuses on five areas of service, operations, resources, personal, and community. This area could provide fertile ground to discuss the core values focusing on the whole person concept behind excellence.

My next set of questions focused on determining the individual and organizational issues confronting our company grade officers with regard to core values. Specifically, they were asked what are the greatest integrity, service, and excellence issues confronting company grade officers today and how well are company grade officers handling these issues. The largest number of integrity remarks dealt in two areas. First, they felt pressure from superiors to falsify or be misleading on documents which highlight training, sortie rates and unit performance criteria. Second, and possibly related, is dealing with superiors who they perceived as only looking out for themselves and their next promotion. At the present time, they feel the company grade officers are able to stand up to these ethical challenges to their integrity and are able to effectively deal with these types of superiors without compromising their integrity. This provides another target rich environment, for field-grade and senior leaders, to discuss integrity with our company

grade officers and arm them with the tools to handle these situations. Not to mention, a reminder for our field-grade and senior officers to remember that we too are accountable for actions and the perceptions our company grade officers have of our commitment to integrity.

The overwhelming response for Service before self focused on the challenges of the increased ops tempo and TDY commitments versus the quality of life for themselves and their families. As to how they are handling this issue, you get a general feeling from reading their responses that they are at a crossroads. In their words, do we continue “sucking it up” or get out. Our senior leadership needs to take a close look at this issue and realize a lot of company grade officers are starting to get frustrated and sitting on the fence waiting to see how we, as an institution, address this issue in the future.

Lastly, I looked at the same question from an Excellence in all we do standpoint. Once again, there was a remarkable amount of similarities in their responses. Their basic feeling was more is being demanded from them than they can provide in an excellent fashion. One response summed it up nicely, “being overtasked beyond our capabilities means sometimes excellent products can’t be delivered in the time required. As these inferior products are accepted, it starts a mindset that maybe ‘good enough’ will always do.” Most respondents felt they are handling the pressures well, but feel constrained by limited time. As a result, our charter as leaders should be clear. In order to strive for excellence in all areas, as espoused by our senior leadership, then we must set them on a course with clear priorities and create a climate which fosters our ideals for excellence through continuous improvement and innovation. If we are grossly overtasking them, then we only get what we deserve: a mediocre end product.

The last objective of the survey measured their perceptions of core value strength among fellow company grade officers. They were asked, in separate questions, on a scale of very low, low, medium, high, and very high what is your perception of integrity, service, and excellence among company grade officers.

Table 1. CGO Core Values Strength

	<i>Integrity</i>		<i>Service</i>		<i>Excellence</i>	
Scale	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Very Low						
Low			3	15 %		
Medium	9	45 %	8	40 %	7	35 %
High	10	50 %	8	40%	13	65 %
Very High			1	5%		
No Answer	1	5 %				
Total	20	100%	20	100%	20	100%

These numbers seem to be reflective in two areas. First, not a single respondent characterized any core value strength as being very low. Conversely, only one respondent, under the category of service, considered any core value strength to be rated as very high. This may reflect how our company grade officers are battling with the concerns they mentioned in the survey. They are confronting such issues as perceiving pressures to carry out the mission at any cost, to include violating their integrity on mission and performance reports, how to balance personal and family time with the high ops tempo and TDY commitments, and finally striving for excellence, but finding only 24 hours in a day. Second, 55 percent of all respondents, stated their perceptions of fellow company grade officer core value strength in service was medium or low. Once again, this issue seems to focus on company grade officers wanting to treat the profession as a calling, but feel as

though they are being tugged at all sides by the greatest limiting factor of all: their time. Third, 65 percent of all respondents characterized excellence as being high. This is an encouraging statistic given their concerns over being tasked to the limit. We can then draw the conclusion, that they recognize their time constraints, but are making quality choices in prioritizing their time. Fourth, when comparing the strength of the core values against one another it begs the question that with our company grade officers striving for excellence and, in their opinion achieving it, at what costs does it exact from them in their perceptions on Service before self. As one company grade officer stated in the survey, “when does doing more with less, become less?” This may become our greatest leadership challenge as we head into the 21st century to balance our most precious resource of people, and the personal and family sacrifices they are making, against the needs of our mission and our nation.

Chapter 3

Uniform Code of Military Justice Statistics

A man can be selfish, cowardly, disloyal, false, fleeting, perjured, and morally corrupt in a wide variety of other ways and still be outstandingly good in pursuits in which other imperatives bear than those upon the fighting man. He can be a superb creative artist, for example, or a scientist in the very top flight, and still be a very bad man. What a bad man cannot be is a good sailor or soldier, or airman. Military institutions thus form a repository of moral resource that should always be a source of strength within the state.¹

– Sir John Winthrop Hackett

This chapter explores the question as to whether the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ) provides sufficient motivation for our company grade officers to adhere to the established standards set by the institution. According to our Manual for Courts–Martial, “the purpose of military law is to promote justice, to assist in maintaining good order and discipline in the armed forces, to promote efficiency and effectiveness in the military establishment, and thereby strengthen the national security of the United States.”² Promoting ethical behavior requires a clear understanding of what we hold to be our standards. Hence, our code of military justice provides a framework for acceptable versus unacceptable behavior.

All of my UCMJ statistics presented in Table 2, 3, and 4 were provided by HQ USAF/JAJM through the Automated Military Justice Analysis Management System.

Table 2 focuses on the number of Article 15's and Courts-Martial offenses given to company grade officers since 1991. Commanders may utilize non-judicial punishment authorized by Article 15 when disciplinary measures are considered to be more serious than administrative, but less serious than a Courts-Martial.

Table 2. CGO Courts-Martial And Article 15 Offenses

	<i>1991</i>		<i>1992</i>		<i>1993</i>		<i>1994</i>		<i>1995</i>		<i>1996</i>	
	CM	Art 15	CM	Art 15	CM	Art 15	CM	Art 15	CM	Art 15	CM	Art 15
2Lt	6	32	3	22	4	19	1	21	9	35	6	35
1Lt	12	44	9	35	4	29	4	24	1	24	5	33
Cpt	27	131	17	116	21	96	14	93	21	111	31	106
Tot	45	207	29	173	29	144	19	148	31	170	42	174

[Please note the number of Article 15's given to our company grade officers have gradually risen since 1994 and Courts-Martial offenses are at their highest level since 1991.] Meanwhile, company grade officer fiscal year end strengths have steadily declined by over 20% during this time period from 60,883 on Sep 30, 1991 to 47, 837 on 30 Sep 1995.³ This provides an overall summary of company grade officer offenses. Next, various Articles will be attached to a core value for analysis.

We will match Integrity first with Article 107—False Official Statements, Service before self with Article 108 – Damage to Government Property and Article 112A – Wrongful Use of an Illegal Substance, while Excellence in all we do is matched with Article 133 – Conducting Unbecoming an Officer and Article 134 offenses of Adultery and Fraternization. UCMJ definitions of these Articles may be found in the Glossary.

Table 3. CGO Specifications Tried Under Courts–Martial

Year	Art 107 False Official Statements	Art 108 Damage to Gov't Property	Art 112A Wrongful Use of an Illegal Substance	Art 133 Conduct Unbecoming an Officer	Art 134 Adultery	Art 134 Fraternization
1996*	16	1	5	86	17	27
1995	12	2	15	31	7	13
1994	3	3	11	24	8	9
1993	5	1	11	53	21	3
1992	1	2	1	26	16	3
1991	20	1	12	50	12	5

*Data is current as of 30 Nov 96

In analyzing the data provided in Table 3 for company grade officer specifications tried under Courts–Martials, we can see the incidents of Article 107, a clear violation of integrity, have increased steadily since 1992. This statistic is revealing, in the fact, that many of the SOS students I surveyed in Chapter 2 listed the pressures to falsify training and performance reports as one of the greatest integrity challenges facing them today. Our service comparison shows little statistical change over the last six years. In fact, 1996 has shown a downward trend in Article 112A offenses. Our final, comparison is Article 133 and 134 incidents with excellence. Statistics from 1996 show a significant rise in Courts–Martial offenses for violations of Article 133. In addition, Courts–Martial offenses for the Article 134 offense of fraternization has doubled from 1995 and risen dramatically over the last six years. Finally Courts–Martial cases for Article 134 adultery incidents have also, risen in 1996 to 17 from last years 11, but still remain close to historical trends.

Table 4. CGO Specifications Tried Under Article 15

Year	Art 107 False Official Statements	Art 108 Damage to Gov't Property	Art 112A Wrongful Use of an Illegal Substance	Art 133 Conduct Unbecoming an Officer	Art 134 Adultery	Art 134 Fraternization
1996*	25	1	0	95	20	14
1995	20	2	1	111	12	16
1994	18	1	1	92	11	10
1993	9	1	1	61	17	4
1992	9	6	0	100	13	2
1991	26	5	0	87	9	7

*Data is current as of 30 Nov 96

Next, we will analyze company grade officer specifications under Article 15 offenses as shown in Table 4. Once again, we see a steady rise in the number of Article 107 incidents, which relate closely to integrity violations, since 1992. The service comparison with Article 108 shows a downward trend while Article 112A has remained steady. Lastly, our excellence comparison remained steady with the exception of Article 134 Adultery violations which are at their highest level in this six year period. Combined with the Courts–Martial statistics we can see Article 134 violations appear to be on the rise. Our senior leadership defines Excellence in all we do from a whole person concept both on and off duty. Very few of the SOS students, on my survey, even associated any word descriptions or identified challenges they face today, from an off duty perspective, as it relates to this core value. The fraternization and adultery issues, given our recent UCMJ trends, provides an excellent area for core values training and discussions.

Given our statistical comparisons, can the UCMJ provide the framework for a solution to our core values dilemma with company grade officers? By itself, the answer would be no. “Laws may be a reflection of the values they uphold, but they are not a

substitute for the values themselves...Those who cannot meet the standards are now, as they have always been, subject to punishment under the Uniform Code of Military Justice.”⁴ We cannot attach our core values to strictly punitive measures, it distorts what both UCMJ stands for as well as the core values we espouse for our officers to internalize.

Therefore, to what purpose can the UCMJ be used towards the development of core values? Simply stated it provides a useful tool for the commander to administer consistent and fair punishment. As Lt Col H. Jayne Martin states, “the need for leadership simply can’t be replaced by statutory enforcement mechanisms...efforts to replace leadership with law by reducing discretion in law enforcement are frequently counterproductive.”⁵ Therefore, commanders play a crucial role in this process. “The military justice system is not a lawyer’s system, it’s a commander’s system,” says Major General Nolan Skulte, the Air Force’s Judge Advocate General. “Starting from the premise that good order and discipline are essential to combat effectiveness, the military justice system supports the commander by giving him a mechanism to instill that order.”⁶ Honest mistakes will occur, we need to acknowledge them, make corrective actions and move on. Our commanders must foster an environment allowing this to happen. On the other hand, when an individual exhibits personal negligence, misbehavior, or disobedience, it is not a mistake. That is a crime and we must take immediately take disciplinary action. Ultimately, it is up to our commanders to ensure their subordinates measure up to the standards of our military profession.

Notes

¹Sir John Winthrop Hackett, “The Military in the Service of the State,” in *AU-24 Concepts for Air Force Leadership*, ed. Dr. Richard I. Lester and Dr. A. Glenn Morton. (Maxwell AFB, AL.: Air University Press, 1996), 72.

Notes

²Manual for Courts–Martial United States, 1995, I–1.

³Compilation of statistics provided in, Tamar A. Mehuron, “The US Air Force in Facts and Figures, *Air Force Magazine*, May 1992, 26, May 1993, 29, May 1994, 28, May 1995, 37, and May 1996, 41.

⁴Lt Lawrence Bauer, “An Ethic Without Heroes,” in *AU–24 Concepts for Air Force Leadership*, ed. Dr. Richard I. Lester and Dr. A. Glenn Morton. (Maxwell AFB, AL.: Air University Press, 1996), 100.

⁵Lt Col H. Jayne Martin, “The Impact of Law and Leadership on the Ethical Behavior of Air Force Officers,” *Journal of Legal Studies*, 1993, 5.

⁶James Kitfield, “Crisis of Conscience,” *Government Executive*, October 1996, 22.

Chapter 4

Role of Mentoring and Commanders

To begin with let's focus on what we are trying to accomplish. A strengthening of values throughout our company grade officer corps. Our task is to change or re-inforce their social perception of those core values our senior leadership have articulated. According to Kurt Lewin, "lectures and other abstract methods of learning produce little effects on outlook and conduct."¹ Lewin goes on to say "A factor of great importance in bringing about a change in sentiment is the degree to which the individual becomes actively involved in the problem."² Our Air Force Instructional System Development Handbook calls for the development of objectives at the affective domain level.³ For instance, a student is required to display a level of learning such as how to listen, perform, qualify, question, and solve. This training can best be accomplished at our commissioning sources by providing our officer candidates with a significant emotional event (SEE). Morris Massey defines a SEE "as a challenge and a disruption to our present behavior patterns and beliefs."⁴ In order to achieve success at creating a SEE, according to Massey, you must meet two requirements. They provide personal impact and clarity.⁵ "Personal impact occurs only when we internalize and think about the consequences while clarity is present when an individual makes the connection between what is happening to him and how his value-based behavior triggered it."⁶ Therefore, it stands to reason, we

must reach our young officers who haven't yet internalized our set of core values on a personal level. I will focus on two specific areas which I feel will provide the greatest opportunity for long-term effects to enhance the officership of our company grade officers.

First, who best to implement and foster individual and organizational change to support the individual—the commander, of course!! A recent study conducted for the Air Staff defined a leader as someone “who motivates skilled people to perform as a team and reach a level higher than the sum of their individual contributions.”⁷ By this definition, you can gain a synergistic effect within your unit to improve efficiency, combat capability, and even values. The paper continues “leadership is the single ingredient that affects all of the ‘human’ factors that define a unit or an institution directly, and as such is the single most powerful influence on the unit’s capability.”⁸ Our commanders play a crucial role in molding core values because of their unique position in the organization.⁹ First, they are highly visible and set the tone for the entire organization. Through their personal conduct they directly influence the organizational style, culture, and character of an organization. Second, by assuming command they receive a mandate to carry out the mission to the best of their ability and to care for their people. Third, trust between superior to subordinate and subordinate to superior becomes a crucial element to effectively lead his troops.¹⁰

Obviously, we need good leaders who can exhibit these special attributes in their commands to foster a climate where our young leaders and troops can flourish. We have all seen some great commanders. One thing they all have in common is their results. The members of their unit display a “we” not “me” attitude, a commitment to the mission and the Air Force as a whole, and an unwavering commitment to the high standards espoused

in our core values.¹¹ Naturally, the role of leadership doesn't stop at the commander, but is an imperative of all officers to model our professional behavior. My survey results show company grade officers are looking toward the field-grade and senior officers to model proper behavior and inspire trust within the organization.

My second recommendation is to develop a mentoring program which can become truly effective at dealing with the issue of core values in our institution today and assist company grade officers in this modeling process. Currently, Air Force Policy Directive 36-34 formally establishes the mentoring program. The directive applies to all officers, but highlights the special emphasis given toward junior officers to help them attain their full potential. "The intent of this directive is to infuse all levels of leadership and mentoring to effect a culture change—one where senior officers can pass on the principles, traditions, shared values, and lessons of our profession."¹² Where the directive falls short is in the execution phase. Although it encourages other mentoring tools, the only avenue the directive mandates, as a minimum requirement, is feedback provided by the subordinate's rater and annotated on the Company Grade Officer Feedback Worksheet (AF Form 724B).

This is not enough. We must encourage and demand more. The path to professionalism requires our "senior leaders to provide guidance to our junior officer in dealing with his work environment, developing his officership skills, and achieving success in the military profession."¹³ Richard Gabriel tells us "This support requires time to develop, but should be based on the common experience of its membership...and the realization that observing the new ethics is the best way to become a successful officer."¹⁴ In order to achieve these lofty goals, it requires spending time with our company grade

officers to explore the concerns they are facing and foster a relationship which is truly beneficial to the advancement of our core values. The benefits can be tremendous.

A 1990 Air War College Study on Mentoring showed 89% of the junior officers surveyed, who had participated in a mentor–mentee role, stated the relationship had a moderate to significant impact on their career.¹⁵ While a staggering 60% of all respondents not having a mentor desired to have one. What an opportunity to capitalize on the advantages of mentoring. It allows for our company grade officer to develop his personal and professional skills while internalizing the shared values of our heritage. Meanwhile the organization benefits from enriching and enhancing a company grade officer to reach his full potential. It creates a win–win proposition. It is important to note that some officers have a negative connotation that mentoring equates to nurturing careerism over professionalism. We must fight to change attitudes and preserve a mentoring program which is solely based on professionalism.

Although, the mentor–mentee relationship is important between supervisor and subordinate another method of mentoring which can have an even great impact is that of group mentoring. This fosters a relationship where not only can the company grade officers gain insights from the senior officer mentor, but also share their own personal and professional experiences with fellow junior officers. This creates a rich environment for our company grade officers to blossom professionally and support one another in their growth. Peer support becomes critical to foster these changes and provides the necessary informal support. Mentoring: A Group Guide notes, “Mentoring can achieve little success if it is an isolated event reserved as a special relationship between protégé and mentor. Truly effective mentoring is integrated into the day–to–day professional life of the

protégé.”¹⁶ The best way to achieve this integration is to work in small mentoring teams with our junior officer force. As field grade and senior officers it is our responsibility to share our experiences and develop the personal and professional talents of our young officers. The synergistic results will reap huge dividends well into the 21st century. As we begin our roles as mentors, John Gardner provides some expert advice:

Mentors are ‘growers,’ good farmers rather than inventors or mechanics. Growers have to accept that the main ingredients and processes with which they work are not under their own control. They are in a patient partnership with nature, with an eye to the weather and a feeling for cultivation. A recognition that seeds sometimes fall on barren ground, a willingness to keep trying, a concern for the growing thing, patience—such are the virtues of the grower. And the mentor.¹⁷

Notes

¹Kurt Lewin, *Resolving Social Conflicts*, (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1948), 60.

²Lewin, *Resolving Social Conflicts*, 63.

³Dr. Richard I. Lester, *Instructional System Development Handbook*, (Maxwell AFB, AL.: Air University, Third Edition, November 1990), 12.

⁴Morris Massey, *The People Puzzle Understanding Yourself and Others*, (Reston, VA.: Reston Publishing Co., 1979), 19.

⁵*Ibid.*, 239.

⁶*Ibid.*, 239.

⁷Core Values, Leadership Development and Career Management for the Air Force in 2025:21.

⁸*Ibid.*, 22.

⁹*Ibid.*, 22.

¹⁰*Ibid.*, 22–23.

¹¹*Ibid.*, 23.

¹²Air Force Policy Directive 36–34, *Air Force Mentoring Program*, 1 November 1996.

¹³Lt Col James D. Young, “Use of a Mentor to Enhance Professionalism in the Air Force,” in *AU–24 Concepts for Air Force Leadership*, ed. Dr. Richard I. Lester and Dr. A. Glenn Morton. (Maxwell AFB, AL.: Air University Press, 1996), 110.

¹⁴Gabriel, 216.

¹⁵Albert E. Lassiter and Danny C. Rehm, “Should the Air Force Establish A Formalized Mentoring Program?,” (Maxwell AFB, AL.: Air War College Research Report, May 1990), 25.

Notes

¹⁶Beverly Kaye and Betsy Jacobson, “Mentoring: A Group Guide,” *Training and Development*, April 1995, 27.

¹⁷Gardner, 169–170.

Chapter 5

Organizational Changes

If employees know what their company stands for, if they know what standards they are to uphold, then they are much more likely to make decisions that will support those standards. They are also more likely to feel as if they are an important part of the organization. They are motivated because life in the company has meaning for them.¹

—Terrence E. Deal and Allan A. Kennedy
Corporate Cultures

Kurt Lewin defines re-education as, “the process by which the individual, in growing into the culture in which he finds himself, acquires the system of values and the set of facts which later come to govern his thinking and conduct.”² In the Air Force, we accomplish this initial indoctrination through our commissioning programs and continue to reinforce these ideals within our units and organization. Our chances for successful revitalization directly lie in our commander’s ability to create a strong we-feeling concept. Naturally, there are forces which work for and against the creation of this strong we-feeling. Lewin states there are two forces which influence these potential changes. He calls them driving and restraining forces. Driving forces are those which “push” us in a certain direction by initiating the change and work to keep it going. On the other hand, restraining forces are those forces which tend to prevent us from accomplishing change and works to decrease the driving forces.³ In John Gardner’s opinion, the disintegration and regenerative

processes concerning values are always at work.⁴ Therefore, we must understand what these forces are and control them to allow for our core values vision to take root.

Using Kurt Lewin's Force Field Analysis Model lets take a look at the driving forces (positive forces) working to promote core values. First, the role of the senior leadership is critical. They identified our core values and publicly pronounce them at every opportunity in speeches, articles, and Air Force policy. Second, we are beginning to see a commitment from the institution and personnel toward our stated core values. This is critical to establishing the strong we-feeling necessary for the organization to make any lasting impact. Third, commander involvement at all levels is essential to talk and walk our values. At the operational level core values must become part of our daily routine in all actions. Fourth, core values need to be stressed in all phases of our career from commissioning programs, PME, to daily life in the units. Lastly, accountability can be a crucial driving force. General Fogleman tells us "The bottom line is simple: Air Force standards must be uniformly known, consistently applied and nonselectively enforced."⁵

Now let's turn the tables and look at the restraining forces (negative forces) working against our movements toward reaching our vision of greater core value internalization. The first factor which causes considerable stress is change. Change takes on two aspects. Foremost, our troops continue to encounter budget cuts, downsizing, changes to roles and missions, technology advances, and a high ops tempo. Next, by human nature, we are resistant to any change and question why our values were okay a decade ago, but not today? What are we doing different? Many don't even recognize a problem exists. Second, is the shift "in standards of morality and permissiveness evident in the larger society coupled with liberalization campaigns for greater individual rights and privileges

within the military itself.”⁶ Third, is the tendency toward viewing the military as just another occupation rather than a profession by civilians, politicians, and even some of our own military personnel who may identify more with their job specialty than with the profession of arms.⁷ Fourth, challenges are taking place from within our profession itself. These are the attitudes of the end justifies the means, where loyalty is given to our superiors over the institution, and excessive concern over the image of the institution by covering up embarrassing situations.⁸ Lastly, is the perception of the accountability standards in the Air Force. Just, as we noted it was a driving force, it becomes a restraining force when perceived as a “one-mistake” Air Force or when accountability standards aren’t equally applied to all.

Now that we have identified some of the forces at play, we can begin to analyze potential courses of action. Rarely does individual character fully explain the values of an organization. Often times the organizational culture itself plays an important role. Our value system should assist in shaping “the design of our organizational systems, and the decision-making process used by our individuals...they provide the common frame of reference.”⁹ With this guiding tenet of using our core values to help shape our organization, lets ask the key question as to “whether our structures and systems that drive individual and team behavior are congruent with our values and guiding principles?”¹⁰ Our strategy needs to be centered on five steps. First, guiding values are clearly communicated. Second, leaders must be committed, credible, and willing to act. Third, core values must be integrated into our decision-making cycle and daily activities. Fourth, our systems and structures must support and reinforce these ideals. Finally, leaders

must possess the skills, knowledge, and competence to make sound ethical decisions on a daily basis.¹¹

With this in mind, let's explore some alignment opportunities found in our Air Force today, as identified from my SOS survey. For instance, does fostering a more with less philosophy run counter to our value of excellence? Second, does our all-volunteer assignment process breed a careerist attitude? Third, is our promotion system viewed as fair and equitable by our officers? Fourth, do our officer performance reports reflect our individual achievements over those of the unit? Finally, does our exceedingly high ops tempo run head on into our quality of life initiatives. A recent study conducted for the Air Staff states, "Alignment among the values, structures, and systems increases the organization's capacity to operate in an environment characterized by rapid change and uncertainty. A lack of alignment creates tension, frustration, despair, and potential failure."¹² The stakes are high. Therefore, as an institution we need to take a real good look in the mirror.

Using Kurt Lewin's model once again, we need to determine the strengths of the driving and restraining forces and attack the issues we can control. We can accomplish this in our units by utilizing a Top-Down and Bottom-Up Approach as identified in our core values strategy. The Top-Down Approach calls for leaders at all levels to identify a method to evaluate the ethical climate in the organization to ensure it is producing positive effects and emphasizing core values in daily operations, feedback, and mentoring sessions.¹³ Conversely, the Bottom-Up Approach allows the members of the organization to bring to the commanders attention any policies, processes, or procedures the organization may be engaged in which may contribute to a "culture of compromise."¹⁴

Once identified the commander must take action to fix the situation or explain why the organization is handling the situation in that fashion.

Our Air Force is lucky to have a rich military tradition. We need to capitalize on this and turn it into a positive force for our troops. John Gardner states, “A healthy community affirms itself and builds morale through ceremonies that honor symbols of shared identity and enable members to rededicate themselves to shared goals.”¹⁵ As we more closely align our fundamental organizational structures around our core values we will release a latent creativity and energy among our people to enhance our mission effectiveness they are empowered to achieve.¹⁶

Notes

¹Dennis T. Jaffe, Cynthia D. Scott, and Glenn R. Tobe, *Organizational Vision, Values, and Mission*, (Menlo Park, CA.: Crisp Publications, Inc., 1993), 22.

²Lewin, *Resolving Social Conflicts*, 58–59.

³Kurt Lewin, *A Dynamic Theory of Personality, Selected Papers*, (New York: McGraw–Hill Book Co. Inc., 1935), 80–96.

⁴Gardner, 77.

⁵General Ronald R. Fogleman, “Chief: Highest Standards are Expected,” *Air Force Times*, 28 August 1995, 13.

⁶Gabriel, 10.

⁷Brig Gen Malham M. Wakin, *War, Morality, and the Military Profession*, (Boulder, CO.: Westview Press, 1986), 213.

⁸Gabriel, 11–13.

⁹Lynn Sharp Paine, “Managing for Organizational Integrity,” *Harvard Business Review*, March – April 1994, 111.

¹⁰Group Decision Support Systems, Inc., A Study presented to HQ/USAF Long–Range Planning, *Conceptual Framework for Building a Values–Based Air Force*, 8.

¹¹Paine, 112.

¹²Group Decision Support Systems, Inc., 8.

¹³United States Air Force Core Values Handbook, n.p..

¹⁴*Ibid.*, n.p..

¹⁵Gardner, 116.

¹⁶Stephen R. Covey, *Principle–Centered Leadership*, (New York: Summit Books, 1991), 163–189.

Chapter 6

Conclusion and Summary

In any community, some people are more or less irretrievably bad and others more or less consistently good. But the behavior of most people is profoundly influenced by the moral climate of the moment. One of the leader's tasks is to help ensure the soundness of that moral climate.¹

—John Gardner

In order to achieve our desired end state of enhanced internalization of company grade officer core values, this paper proposed the necessity of an adequate needs assessment. My SOS survey on core values provides a first step towards that goal by determining word descriptions of Integrity first, Service before self, and Excellence in all we do, highlighting the greatest core values issues facing company grade officers today, and measuring their perception on the relative strength of core values among fellow company grade officers. The number one integrity issue, they identified, was the perceived pressures placed on them, from superior officers, to provide false or misleading statements or reports concerning mission capabilities. Second, the greatest service concern was the increased ops tempo and TDY requirements versus the need for a balanced personal and family life. Finally, the top excellence issue focused on how to give their best performance on every mission tasking given time constraints.

Next, we reviewed UCMJ statistics for any trends they may show and to determine their applicability to enhancing our core values training. The trends are disturbing. Even

though company grade officer end strengths are declining the number of Courts–Martials for junior officers since 1991 and Article 15’s since 1993 are at their highest levels. With regard to individual Articles, both Courts–Martials and Article 15’s for Article 107 – False Official Statements are at their peak since 1991. Next, Courts–Martials for Article 134 – Fraternization has steadily increased over the last six year period and recently doubled from 13 in 1995 to 27 in 1996. Finally, both Article 15’s and Courts–Martials are at their highest level since 1993 for Article 134 – Adultery offenses. Standards of accountability are very important in the profession of arms because of the nature and severity of our business to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. However, we cannot allow the sole motivation of our individuals or our organizational norms to be exclusively driven by punitive measures in the UCMJ. Instead, we determined, “the need for leadership simply can’t be replaced by statutory enforcement mechanisms.”²

Therefore, the role of the commander in shaping our future is critical. As Secretary Widnall states, “The character of its leaders shapes the destiny of the organization.”³ Mentoring provides the tool to reverse the trends of core value internalization among our company grade officers. In particular, group mentoring can be highly effective with the additional benefit of providing our company grade officers with peer support. Mentoring is serious business, and requires daily, personal contact. The minimums established in AFRD 36–34, Air Force Mentoring Program are to infrequent to fully explore, discuss, and encourage professional growth. Our desire for increased values among company grade officers can’t be accomplished in a classroom but, must become an everyday reality. Dr. Toner, reminds us, we need to practice daily because as any athletic coach will tell you, we play as we practice.⁴ History will judge us not on how we talked about values, but

what actions we take. John Gardner cautions, “Only living values count. They must be reflected in actual behavior, embedded in our laws and institutions.”⁵ We can not afford repeat a major finding from a 1970 Army War College Study: “Every junior officer that we talked to was looking so strongly at their senior officers for standards that they could follow that it almost hurt. The number of times that they felt that they have been let down by looking for higher standards from senior officers and not finding them is innumerable.”⁶

However, improvements in our personal character only gets us halfway there. Our organizational structures and operating procedures must change to reflect our institutional values. Some of our driving and restraining forces are beyond our control, such as improving the product society gives the military and the forces reducing our manpower and budgets. However, others we can directly influence, as leaders and commanders, by planning for the future of our Air Force. First, we must do a better job enforcing the standards of accountability across our rank structure. Nothing will turn the company grade officers off more than being severely punished for the same offense that a senior officer gets a slap on the wrist for. Second, what does the all-volunteer assignment process say about Service before self? Shouldn't every position be filled by the most qualified and capable individual? Third, is our promotion system the fairest and most equitable measure of performance and potential? Fourth, how can we get our core values to head north when often times quality of life seems to be heading south. The high ops tempo and TDY commitments are taking their toll on our personnel. A study conducted for long-range plans concludes, “quality of life programs, compensation, benefits, support services and expected retirement compensation must be competitive with those in the civilian and non-military public sectors.”⁷ We must attack these issues by looking at the

desired end state of our organization. From the top to the bottom, the character values we want to see in our officers should also be found in every Air Force program, policy and system. Alignment is critical to any long-term change. We must walk the walk.

The implications of this study is far-reaching. The bridge we build to the 21st century must be built on a solid foundation of character. General Fogleman and Secretary Widnall have defined the desired end-state through our core values. Internalization of core values, among company grade officers are imperative to the survival of our profession of arms. This study has provided a measuring stick for where we are at today and what a recommended course of action should entail to achieve our desired goals.

There is still much we don't know about our core values. We need to continue our research efforts. A larger study needs to be accomplished to adequately determine the present state of company grade officer core values internalization. In addition, we need to consider other segments of the Air Force population to include Airmen, NCO's and civilians? As new core values training programs come on line how successful will they be? How will the advance of technology and weapon system development affect our core values? The future provides not only potential problems, but offers tremendous promise and opportunity to leave the Air Force a better institution than we found it.

Notes

¹Gardner, 193

²H. Martin Jayne, 5.

³Widnall, 421.

⁴Dr. James H. Toner, Col Richard Szafranski, and Lt William D. Casebeer, "Military Ethics," *Airpower Journal*, Winter 1994, 24.

⁵Gardner, 192.

⁶Ibid., 215.

⁷Core Values, Leadership Development and Career Management for the Air Force of 2025:29.

Appendix A

SOS Survey And Results

Statement of the Research Question: What is the status and current health of Air Force core values among our company grade officer corps and where should we focus our efforts to improve company grade officer internalization of these values.

- Objectives:
- Determine a word description picture from a company grade officer perspective of Air Force core values
 - Determine individual and organizational issues affecting the internalization of these core values by company grade officers
 - Determine from a company grade officer perspective how they are handling these internalization issues
 - Determine a scaled measure from a company grade officer perspective on their perception of core value strength among fellow company grade officers

** Numbers in parenthesis indicate the aggregate of similar responses **

** Comments in parenthesis after questions 2, 5, & 8 represent responses from the respondent as to how well company grade officers are handling that particular issue**

1. Please provide a word description or examples of behavior which would characterize poor, average, and outstanding “integrity” for a company grade officer?

Poor:

- Disloyal, liar, cheat
- Mislead
- Blame others for shortcomings
- “Fudging” data to fill squares
- Trying to gain an upperhand by cheating or lying to commanders to offset poor job knowledge
- Cheating on a test (2)

- Dishonesty (2)
- What goes TDY stays TDY (2)
- Cheats on spouse
- “Fudges” travel voucher
- Stealing software from work to put on PC at home
- Changing bomb scores to get Top Gun
- “Bum”
- False reporting on an official document
- “Doctoring” Mission Capable reports
- Situational standards
- Doesn’t inspire trust from peers or subordinates
- Can’t back up actions
- Lying to your supervisor
- “Pencil-whipping” (2)
- Not being factual and stretching the truth on performance reports
- Not “calling” your superiors on improper behavior

Average:

- Does job in a manner that keeps him out of trouble
- Operating in the gray area and choosing what is best for the individual
- Tries to tell the truth, but at times tells people what they want to hear
- Not taking a stand either way
- Allow others to lie and cheat, but you wouldn’t do it yourself (2)
- Thinking about cheating on a test, but doesn’t
- “Pencil-whipping” training reports
- Different attitudes between on and off duty
- Signing off flying training events to remain current
- Fair
- Doing what is right when someone is looking
- Situational and inconsistent standards
- Occasional questioning of superiors actions which seem inappropriate (2)
- Not cheating on a test when it would be easy to do so
- Holding themselves (and only themselves) accountable

Outstanding:

- Having the fortitude to admit fault and accept responsibility (2)
- Honesty (3)
- Honesty at all costs
- Trustworthy
- Adhering to a set of principles no matter what the situation
- Does what is right when no one is looking (2)
- Turning in a buddy for cheating on a test
- Willing to develop and defend a position on a controversial issue
- High standards for himself and others

- Admitting you did drugs on a background check for security clearance
- Admitting to “over g-ing” an airplane on a solo ride in UPT
- Standing up for what is right
- Actions and words which inspire trust and devotion from subordinates
- Speaking the truth and doing what is right, no matter the consequences
- Confronting a commander when they have “fudged” paperwork
- “Calling” your commander for inappropriate actions on the spot

2. What do you feel are the greatest “integrity” issues confronting company grade officers today? In your opinion, how well are they handling these issues?

- Accepting as fact their own far-reaching OPR written by supervisors
- Putting company grade officers in a position to either cut corners or possibly not accomplish the mission (Doing well to raise the attention)
- Try to meet sortie and training rates, but are discouraged to report it
- CSORTS—moving parts from one kit to another to make it pass, but it means the other one isn’t in compliance, but when we look at that one we move it back to the original
- Confronting rapid change
- Some commanders who desire to be promoted want company grade officers to alter data so the commander looks good (In general, company grade officers have higher standards than previously and will stand up to bad bosses)
- Being asked to compile or present false data to support a position or protest someone’s “rice bowl” (Doing okay, but resisting is a matter of avoiding punishment not adherence to integrity)
- Falsifying and changing numbers to fit the commanders/units needs on metrics and training reports
- Reporting on inappropriate behavior of senior officers (Issues are being swept under the carpet for fear of placing their career in jeopardy)
- Breaking out of the old ways of doing things where lapses were overlooked or even condoned (Most company grade officers are doing a good job, but need the senior leadership to set the example)
- Day to day things like training records and travel vouchers
- “Pencil-whipping” to get the job done
- Using Air Force equipment for personal use such as computers, vehicles, and DSN
- The perception of the “one-mistake” Air Force—(company grade officers are becoming afraid to take the risks) (2)
- Doing what is best versus what is best for their career(not handling it very well)
- Watching field grade officers not being held accountable to AF standards

- Dealing with superiors who don't inspire trust and act in a "two-faced" manner (Overall think company grade officers are becoming better prepared to confront superiors)
- The need to make rank and look good versus being honest or taking a stand against a popular opinion which may be wrong (company grade officers are handling it well, but need the continued support and encouragement by supervisors and senior officers)
- "Cut throat mentality" of officer promotion system (in some cases peers are getting out)
- Speaking out against improper conduct if they know it will get a friend or supervisor in trouble (Very few company grade officers would attempt to do that)
- Fraternization (company grade officers are beginning to call each other on this more often)

3. On a scale of very low, low, medium, high, and very high what is your perception of "integrity" among company grade officers?

<u>Scale Rating</u>	<u>#of Respondents</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Medium	9	45 %
High	10	50 %
No Answer	1	5 %

4. Please provide a word description or examples of behavior which would characterize poor, average, and outstanding "Service before self" for a company grade officer?

Poor:

- Constant complaints about the work load
- Always finding fault with the organization or institution
- Consistently leaving work early (4)
- Getting out of deploying because I want to watch the Super Bowl
- Forever complaining about how the Air Force doesn't care about its people (TDY's, bad assignments, etc.)
- Give me my pilot bonus or I'm getting out (2)
- Getting out of "crappy" TDY's but working the system to get the best ones
- "Blowing off" PME
- Taking credit for a job someone else did
- Having a "Me" attitude (2)
- Complaining about going TDY
- Never showing up for work unless you are told you have to
- Dishonesty
- My family comes first
- Careerism

- Concentrating on tasks only for promotion and not to better the organization
- “Weaseling” their way out of bad assignments and TDY’s
- Obnoxious about performing job tasks when asked by superiors

Average:

- Going where they are told (TDY, assignment) without complaining
- Getting the job done, but not putting in 110% effort into the task
- Trusting that your commander knows what is best for you and the Air Force
- “I’ll do this now, but remember me when I need your help”
- Most people are average. They work full, long days at work and frequently go TDY. This makes it average, but demands a lot of sacrifice for most people, especially for their families.
- Only complaining after 200 days TDY in a year
- Having a “job” attitude
- Coming in on the weekends and staying late at night to get your work done
- “If it suits me and the Air Force then I’ll do it”
- Getting the job done right and on time – most of the time
- Willing to take remote tours
- Working overtime when necessary
- Just doing your job without looking at how you could best use your abilities to help the Air Force
- Deploying while missing Thanksgiving, Christmas, New Years, anniversary, and birthday without complaining
- Doing exactly what you are told to do and no more
- Unwilling to sacrifice
- Doing whatever it takes to accomplish the mission
- Performing your tasks without complaint

Outstanding:

- Committed
- Caring
- Dedicated
- Volunteering to go TDY for over 200 days per year
- Combining the needs of the Air Force with your best skills and abilities
- Producing an entire training program during your time off
- Accept assignments and taskings based on the needs of the Air Force
- Putting in whatever it takes to get it done right the first time (2)
- Sacrificing my true desires for others and the Air Force
- Volunteering to go on a 3-month TDY to Saudi because the squadron needs you
- Having a “mission” attitude

- Willingness to do whatever is necessary to get the mission done (2)
- People working on weekends and nights when people don't realize, including their bosses that they are in there doing overtime
- Adapting free time to ensure the mission gets done
- Applying self, but doing what is best for the Air Force when called upon
- Putting country and organization before own needs
- Doesn't take credit and relies on supervisors to notice their efforts
- Getting the job done while sacrificing personal pleasures (working on a 3-day weekend) and personal gain (stressing teamwork, not just your role)
- Volunteering for the "tough" jobs

5. What do you feel are the greatest "Service before self" issues confronting company grade officers today? In your opinion, how well are they handling these issues?

- Increased ops tempo (Some positive statements, but generally state not handling well) (7)
- Increased TDY commitments (Some positive statements, but generally state not handling well)(6)
- Assignments process (Handling well)
- Additional duties responsibilities (Handling well)
- Doing the job well and stressing the team concept without blowing your own horn (handling above average)
- Too much emphasis on master degrees and collecting OPR bullets to improve promotion opportunity
- Sacrificing family lifestyle to meet the heavy ops tempo and smaller Air Force (We're either "sucking it up" and doing the mission or getting out of the service) (3)
- Family and life coming before the service
- Some pilots are having trouble staying in because they want more money and benefits—I realize they must think about their families, but what about the needs of the Air Force
 - Why cater to greedy pilots? Get them out and bring true warriors in to take their place.
 - The attitude that this is just a job and not a calling.
 - Company grade officers are getting very frustrated with what the service is doing for them
 - Trying to combine family issues, the need (mandatory) for a masters degree, and trying to do your job when at any point you could be sent to the desert for 90 days (not handling well)

6. On a scale of very low, low, medium, high, and very high what is your perception of "Service before self" among company grade officers?

<u>Scale Rating</u>	<u>#of Respondents</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Low	3	15 %
Medium	8	40 %
High	8	40 %
Very High	1	5 %

7. Please provide a word description or examples of behavior which would characterize poor, average, and outstanding “Excellence in all we do” issues for a company grade officer?

Poor:

- Uncommitted and being carried by co-workers
- Not checking work for accuracy
- “Pencil-whipping” and falsifying books
- Not taking your job seriously
- Telling a subordinate to write their own OPR and then signing it
- Disregarding training standards
- “Good enough for government work” (4)
- No loyalty to the mission
- “Max the minimums”—simply meet the standards (2)
- Doing the job as fast as possible to fill the square
- Doing the minimums on projects—really noticeable on “Quality stuff”
- That’s not my job statements
- Looking good in front of the commander only
- Accepting “shabby” work
- Lazy
- Not open to feedback
- Not maintaining high standards of conduct inside and outside the work environment

Average:

- Meeting standards, but not putting their whole heart behind the effort
- Making sure you and your unit produce a high quality project
- Not maintaining high standards outside the work environment
- Working hard at all your Air Force jobs
- What is the minimum amount of work needed
- Working hard everyday to do a good job on their assigned projects and learning their weapon system and additional duties
- Just doing their job
- Putting in a “half-hearted” effort into a task because you don’t have time to do anymore
- Trying hard to excel in mission related duties, but “sluffing” off on routine day to day responsibilities
- “Good enough for now and I’ll fix it later if I need to”

- “Another day, another dollar”
- “Good enough for government work”
- Getting inputs from subordinates, writing the OPR, then working with the additional rater to fine tune the OPR
- Just getting by
- Trying the best to meet the priorities of the unit while letting other areas slide
- Doing exactly what is asked
- Does what is required

Outstanding:

- Willing to go the “extra” mile (3)
- Self-motivated person
- Trying to meet all requirements and surpass expectations
- Doing the very best you can
- Conducting all feedback in an honest, non-inflated manner
- Committing time to improve the processes
- Providing the best—the first time
- Not giving or accepting “shoddy” results
- Giving your best even in the less desirable and unexciting duties
- Knowing your limitations and only “biting off what you can chew”. This will allow a person to do the best job they can on a task
- Having a “team” attitude
- An attitude of “This is the most important job in the world”
- Being an expert in a weapon system
- What else can I do to make my organization better (2)
- Striving in all you do in the Air Force and civilian life
- Striving for a high level of success in current job
- If you make a mistake—strive to correct, learn, and move on
- Setting high standards in all areas of our lives regardless of the personal outcomes
- Continually striving to make the unit shine

8. What do you feel are the greatest “Excellence in all we do” issues confronting company grade officers today? In your opinion, how well are they handling these issues?

- With today’s moral decline in society, maintaining high standards with increased outside pressures to lower them (handling above average)
- Excessive stress on business mentality and quality metrics
- Trying to balance all the extra duties with our primary jobs
- “Slackers”
- We demand so much out of people—all the extra projects and additional duties (2)
- Commanders put so much emphasis on them that we have lost focus on important things like becoming an expert in our weapon system

- OPR “fodder” versus really working to improve an organization
- Society today teaches us that we should do as little as possible and reap the benefits.
- Society is molding our new generation and the future instead of our parents
- Physical fitness is a “joke”. Embarrassment to us working in the joint world.
- Being overtasked beyond our capabilities means sometimes excellent products can’t be delivered in the time required. As these inferior products are accepted, it starts a mindset that maybe “good enough” will always do
- Because of the uneasy security in the military profession, the company grade officers aren’t as committed to being officers first. They do what they need to get by.
- Subjective measurements are being inflated
- Trying to find enough time to really know our job—makes it easy to drop job knowledge first
- Choosing what areas we need to do well in lieu of less important duties due to scarce resources and high ops tempo
- Difficulty is trying to do more with less. More TDYs and less equipment and people forces cutting corners. (Doing okay) (2)

9. On a scale of very low, low, medium, high, and very high what is your perception of “Excellence in all we do” among company grade officers?

<u>Scale Rating</u>	<u>#of Respondents</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Medium	7	35 %
High	13	65 %

Glossary

Article 107 False Official Statements. The intent to deceive, signs any false record, return, regulation, order, or other official document, knowing it to be false, or makes any other false official statement knowing it to be false. (Manual for Courts–Martial United States, 1995)

Article 108 Military property of the United States – Loss, damage, destruction, or wrongful disposition. Without proper authority—1) sells or otherwise disposes of; 2) willfully or through neglect damages, destroys, or loses; or 3) willfully or through neglect suffers to be lost, damaged, sold, or wrongfully disposed of; any military property of the United States. (Manual for Courts–Martial United States, 1995)

Article 112A Wrongful use, possession, etc., of controlled substances. Any person who wrongfully uses, possesses, manufactures, distributes, imports into the customs territory of the United States, exports from the United States, or introduces into an installation, vessel, vehicle, or aircraft used under the control of the armed forces a specified substance. (Manual for Courts–Martial United States, 1995)

Article 133 Conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman. Action or behavior in an official capacity which, in dishonoring or disgracing the person as an officer, seriously compromises the officer’s character as a gentleman, or action or behavior in an unofficial or private capacity which, in dishonoring or disgracing the officer personally, seriously compromises the person’s standing as an officer. (Manual for Courts–Martial United States, 1995)

Article 134 General Article (Adultery). 1) That the accused wrongfully had sexual intercourse with a certain person; 2) That, at the time, the accused or the other person was married to someone else; and 3) That, under the circumstances, the conduct of the accused was to the prejudice of good order and discipline in the armed forces or was of a nature to bring discredit upon the armed forces. (Manual for Courts–Martial United States, 1995)

Article 134 General Article (Fraternization). 1) That the accused was a commissioned or warrant officer; 2) That the accused fraternized on terms of military equality with one or more certain enlisted member(s) in a certain manner; 3) That the accused then knew the person(s) to be (an) enlisted member(s); 4) That such fraternization violated the custom of the accused’s service that officers shall not fraternize with enlisted members on terms of military equality; and 5) That, under the circumstances, the conduct of the accused was to the prejudice of good order and discipline in the armed forces or was of a nature to bring discredit upon the armed forces. (Manual for Courts–Martial United States, 1995)

Core values. Certain ideals which are the heart and soul of your proud heritage and essential to your future success. The Air Force defines these as Integrity first, Service before self, and Excellence in all we do.¹

Internalize. To incorporate (as values, patterns of culture, motives, restraints) within the self as conscious or subconscious guiding principles through learning and socialization. (Webster)

Company Grade Officer. Captain, 1Lt, and 2Lt. Used interchangeably with junior officer. (Air Force standard)

Mentoring. Is a relationship in which a person with greater experience and wisdom guides another person to develop both personally and professionally. (AFPD 36–34)

Notes

¹Fogleman and Widnall, 73.

Bibliography

Books

- Ballance, Judy. *The Quality Approach, Second Edition*. Maxwell AFB, AL.: Air University, 1994.
- Covey, Stephen R. *Principle-Centered Leadership*. New York: Summit Books, 1991.
- Gabriel, Richard A. *To Serve with Honor: A Treatise on Military Ethics and the Way of the Soldier*. Westport, CT.: Greenwood Press, 1982.
- Gardner, John W. *On Leadership*. New York: The Free Press, 1990.
- Jaffe, Dennis T., Scott, Cynthia D., and Tobe, Glenn R. *Organizational Vision, Values and Mission*. Menlo Park, CA.: Crisp Publications, Inc., 1993.
- Lester, Richard I. *Instructional System Development Handbook, Third Edition*. Maxwell AFB, AL.: Air University, 1990.
- Lewin Kurt. *A Dynamic Theory of Personality, Selected Papers*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co. Inc., 1935.
- Lewin, Kurt. *Resolving Social Conflicts*. New York: Harper, 1948.
- Marshall, S.L.A. *The Officer as a Leader*. Harrisburg, PA.: The Telegraph Press, 1966.
- Massey, Morris. *The People Puzzle: Understanding Yourself and Others*. Reston, VA.: Reston Publishing Company, 1979.
- Wakin, Brig Gen Malham M., ed. *War, Morality, and the Military Profession*, Boulder, CO.: Westview Press, 1986.
- Wenker, Col Kenneth H., et al. *Ethics in the US Air Force: 1988*. Maxwell AFB, AL.: Air University Press, 1990.

Reports

- Davenport, Lt Col Richard B. *Leading People in Today's Military: A Look at the impact of Changing Values on Senior Leadership in the Armed Forces*. Maxwell AFB, AL.: Air University, April 1994.
- Lassiter, Albert E. and Rehm, Danny C. *Should the Air Force Establish a Formalized Mentoring Program?*. Maxwell AFB, AL.: Air University, May 1990.

Manual and Directives

- AETC Policy Directive 36-1. *AETC Mentoring Program*, January 1996.
- AFI 36-2903. *Dress and Personal Appearance of Air Force Personnel*, July 1994.
- AFI 36-2908. *Family Care Plans*, July 1994.
- AFI 36-2909. *Professional and Unprofessional Relationships*, 1 May 1996.
- AFPD 36-29. *Military Standards*, March 1994.
- AFPD 36-34. *Air Force Mentoring Program*, 1 November 1996.

Manual for Courts-Martial United States, 1995 Edition.

Periodicals

- Anton, Genevieve. "Question of Honor: The Air Force Academy Fights the Erosion of Basic Values." *Air Force Times*, no. 54 (7 March 1994): 12–14.
- Clement, Ronald W. "Culture, Leadership, and Power: The Keys to Organizational Change." *Business Horizon*, January/February 1994, 33–39.
- Fogleman, Gen Ronald R. "Chief: Highest Standards are Expected." *Air Force Times*, 28 August 1995, 13.
- Fogleman, Gen Ronald R. "Integrity." *Air Force Magazine*, February 1996, 90–91.
- Fogleman, Gen Ronald R. "What the Air Force Expects of You." *Air Force Times*, 13 May 1996, 33.
- Hall, Maj Brian F. and Wagie, Col David A. "The US Air Force Academy's Cutting-Edge Character Development Program." *Airpower Journal*, Summer 1996, 35–39.
- Jayne, Lt Col H. Martin. "The Impact of Law and Leadership on the Ethical Behavior of Air Force Officers." *Journal of Legal Studies*, no 4 (1993): 1–12.
- Kaye, Beverly and Jacobson, Betsy. "Mentoring: A Group Guide." *Training and Development*, April 1995, 23–27.
- Kitfield, James. "Crisis of Conscience." *Government Executive*, October 1995, 14–24.
- Mehuron, Tamar A. "The US Air Force in Facts and Figures." *Air Force Magazine*, May 1992, 23–50.
- Mehuron, Tamar A. "The US Air Force in Facts and Figures." *Air Force Magazine*, May 1993, 27–56.
- Mehuron, Tamar A. "The US Air Force in Facts and Figures." *Air Force Magazine*, May 1994, 27–54.
- Mehuron, Tamar A. "The US Air Force in Facts and Figures." *Air Force Magazine*, May 1995, 35–66.
- Mehuron, Tamar A. "The US Air Force in Facts and Figures." *Air Force Magazine*, May 1996, 39–72.
- Paine, Lynn Sharp. "Managing for Organizational Integrity." *Harvard Business Review*, no 72 (March–April 1994): 106–117.
- Reimer, Gen Dennis J. "Leadership for the 21st Century: Empowerment, Environment and the Golden Rule." *Military Review*, January–February 1996, 4–9.
- Szafranski, Col Richard, Toner, Dr. James H. and Casebeer, Lt William D. "Military Ethics." *Airpower Journal*, Winter 1994, 15–25.
- Toner, Dr. James H. "Teaching Military Ethics." *Military Review*, May 1993, 33–40.
- Wakin, Brig Gen Malham M. "Professional Integrity." *Airpower Journal*, Summer 1996, 23–29.
- Widnall, Secretary Sheila E. "Watch Your Character – It Becomes Your Destiny." *Airman*, April 1994, 34–39.

Work of one author in a work edited by another

- Baucom, Lt Col Donald R. "The Professional Soldier and the Warrior Spirit." In *AU-24 Concepts for Air Force Leadership*. Edited by Dr. Richard I. Lester and Dr. A. Glenn Morton. Maxwell AFB, AL.: Air University Press, 1996.

- Bauer, Lt Lawrence. "An Ethic Without Heroes." In *AU-24 Concepts for Air Force Leadership*. Edited by Dr. Richard I. Lester and Dr. A. Glenn Morton. Maxwell AFB, AL.: Air University Press, 1996.
- Cassidy, Gen Duane H. "A Leadership Perspective." In *AU-24 Concepts for Air Force Leadership*. Edited by Dr. Richard I. Lester and Dr. A. Glenn Morton. Maxwell AFB, AL.: Air University Press, 1996.
- Creech, Gen W.L. "Organizational and Leadership Principles for Senior Leaders." In *AU-24 Concepts for Air Force Leadership*. Edited by Dr. Richard I. Lester and Dr. A. Glenn Morton. Maxwell AFB, AL.: Air University Press, 1996.
- Cronin, Thomas E. "Thinking and Learning about Leadership." In *AU-24 Concepts for Air Force Leadership*. Edited by Dr. Richard I. Lester and Dr. A. Glenn Morton. Maxwell AFB, AL.: Air University Press, 1996.
- Fogleman, Gen Ronald R. "The Leadership-Integrity Link." In *AU-24 Concepts for Air Force Leadership*. Edited by Dr. Richard I. Lester and Dr. A. Glenn Morton. Maxwell AFB, AL.: Air University Press, 1996.
- Fogleman, Gen Ronald R. and Widnall, Secretary Sheila E. "Core Values." In *AU-24 Concepts for Air Force Leadership*. Edited by Dr. Richard I. Lester and Dr. A. Glenn Morton. Maxwell AFB, AL.: Air University Press, 1996.
- Hackett, Sir John Winthrop. "The Military in the Service of the State." In *AU-24 Concepts for Air Force Leadership*. Edited by Dr. Richard I. Lester and Dr. A. Glenn Morton. Maxwell AFB, AL.: Air University Press, 1996.
- Roberts, Lt Col Alexander B. "Core Values in a Quality Air Force: The Leadership Challenge." In *AU-24 Concepts for Air Force Leadership*. Edited by Dr. Richard I. Lester and Dr. A. Glenn Morton. Maxwell AFB, AL.: Air University Press, 1996.
- Sampson, Col Orwyn. "The Military Oath of Office." In *AU-24 Concepts for Air Force Leadership*. Edited by Dr. Richard I. Lester and Dr. A. Glenn Morton. Maxwell AFB, AL.: Air University Press, 1996.
- Widnall, Secretary Sheila E. "Perspectives on Leadership." In *AU-24 Concepts for Air Force Leadership*. Edited by Dr. Richard I. Lester and Dr. A. Glenn Morton. Maxwell AFB, AL.: Air University Press, 1996.
- Young, Lt Col James D. "Use of a Mentor to Enhance Professionalism in the Air Force." In *AU-24 Concepts for Air Force Leadership*. Edited by Dr. Richard I. Lester and Dr. A. Glenn Morton. Maxwell AFB, AL.: Air University Press, 1996.
- Zak, Maj Bryan. "Today's Air Force Requires Big L's That Support and Encourage Little l's." In *AU-24 Concepts for Air Force Leadership*. Edited by Dr. Richard I. Lester and Dr. A. Glenn Morton. Maxwell AFB, AL.: Air University Press, 1996.

Unpublished Papers

- "Conceptual Framework for Building a Values-Based Air Force." A Study conducted by Group Decision Support Systems, Inc., n.d.
- "Core Values, Leadership Development and Career Management." A Study conducted for HQ USAF Long-Range Planning, n.d.
- "Impact of Factors Affecting the Air Force Education and Training System in the Year 2025." A Study conducted for HQ USAF Long-Range Planning, n.d.

Computer Network

“United States Air Force Core Values Handbook.” 1 January 1997, n.p. On-line. Internet, 30 October 1996. Available from <http://usafa.af.mil/core-value>.

Staff Sources

HQ USAF/JAJM. *Company Grade Officer Statistical Inquiry for Major Brian D. Anderson from the Automated Military Justice Analysis Management System.*

DISTRIBUTION A:

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

Air Command and Staff College
Maxwell AFB, Al 36112